



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,308	06/25/2003	Michael R. Resetarits	KOCH.98849	3204

27910 7590 12/23/2004

STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP  
ATTN: PATENT GROUP  
1201 WALNUT STREET, SUITE 2800  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64106-2150

EXAMINER
----------

BUSHEY, CHARLES S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,308

Applicant(s)

RESEARITS ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Bushey

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4-7,9-13,15-17,20,22-26,30-32 and 34-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,8,14,18,19,21,27-29,33,37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-20-04,12-6-04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species A, as depicted by Figure 1 in the reply filed on November 2, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that at least claims 1, 18, and 21 are generic, and dependent claims which read on the individual species, as set forth in the restriction requirement are dependent upon claim 1. This is not found persuasive because claim 1, while it may be generic, is not currently allowable. As set forth in the restriction requirement, Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

It is noted that applicant has stated that claims 1, 3, 8, 14, 18, 19, 21, 27-29, 33, 37, and 38 read on the elected species. Accordingly, claims 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20, 22-26, 30-32, and 34-36 are withdrawn from further consideration, while claims 1, 3, 8, 14, 18, 19, 21, 27-29, 33, 37, and 38 have been examined on the merits herein.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1724

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 28, 33, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sheinman (Figs. 1 and 2).

5. Claims 1, 3, 8, 18, 19, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Buchanan et al US 2004/0104493 A1 (Fig. 4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1724

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheinman.

Sheinman (Figs. 1 and 2) as applied above substantially discloses applicant's invention as recited by instant claims 29 and 37, except for the angled blades being curved, as set forth by instant claim 29 and two or more cans having different sizes, as set forth by instant claim 37. Wherein modification of otherwise known elements within an otherwise known apparatus through simple changes in shape and/or size has long been established as obvious means of carrying the invention of another forward, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention, to modify the shape of the angled blades of the reference to curved and further to modify the sizes of individual cans, such that optimal contact and separation of the phases would occur within the known apparatus. Note *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237; *In re Reven*, 156 USPQ 679; *In re Dailey et al*, 149 USPQ 47.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al US 2004/0104493 A1.

Buchanan et al US 2004/0104493 A1 (Fig. 4) as applied above substantially disclose applicant's invention as recited by instant claim 14, except for two or more cans having different sizes. Wherein modification of otherwise known elements within an otherwise known apparatus through simple changes in size has long been established as obvious means of carrying the invention of another forward, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention, to modify the sizes of individual cans, such that optimal contact and separation of the

Art Unit: 1724

phases would occur within the known apparatus. Note *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237; *In re Reven*, 156 USPQ 679.

**Conclusion**


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Bushey whose telephone number is (571) 272-1153. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Bushey  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1724

  
12-21-04

csb  
12-21-04